

# Duke University

Durham  
North Carolina  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
304 UNION WEST  
BOX 90928

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

PHONE (919)684-6447  
FAX(919)681-8606  
EMAIL: ACOUNCIL@ACPUB.DUKE.EDU

November 30, 2000

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on Thursday, November 30, 2000 from 3:45 p.m. - 5:20 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Prof. Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies) presiding.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** called the meeting to order and reminded members that the December 7 meeting had been cancelled and that the next meeting would be on Thursday, January 18. Because of the short time between the last meeting and the present one, the November 16 minutes and **the** minutes from this meeting would both be submitted for approval at the January meeting. He then announced the formation of the regular mid-term review committee for President Keohane which included the following faculty representatives: John **Baillie** (Gastroenterology/Medicine), Toril **Moi** (Literature) and Richard **Schmalbeck** (Law). The committee would begin meeting in January.

### RESOLUTION ON NSOE NAME CHANGE AND CREATION OF THREE NEW DIVISIONS

Professor **Burian** turned to the second agenda item, namely the Nicholas School's proposal to change its name and to create three divisions. The resolution from the Executive Committee of the Academic Council would be put to a vote. [It reads as follows:]

WHEREAS, the Nicholas School of the Environment, through its Faculty Council and through Dean Norman Christensen, has proposed the name of the Nicholas School of the Environment be changed to The Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences, and to create three new divisions (Earth and Ocean Sciences, Environmental Sciences and Policy, and Coastal Systems Science and Policy), and

WHEREAS, the proposal has the endorsement of the Academic Priorities Committee and the support of Provost Peter Lange, and

WHEREAS, the Academic Council Executive Committee, finding the review process to be sound and the proposal well documented recommends approval,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Council endorses the request that

the current Nicholas School of the Environment be renamed the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences, with three divisions (Earth and Ocean Sciences, Environmental Sciences and Policy, and Coastal Systems Science and Policy).

A motion to adopt the above resolution was made and seconded. The **Chair** said that before a vote was taken, the Provost wanted to express his support. There wasn't much time for a long discussion, but if there were new issues to be raised a few minutes were available before Council moved to vote on the resolution.

Before the Provost could speak, however, Professor **Rojstaczer** (NSOE) wished to add to his comments he made at the previous meeting of the Council. He said he wanted to talk about a more narrow topic which was that somehow this merger and this name change and restructuring were going to help the Earth Sciences at Duke University. There was really no foundation for that. It was something that was very unlike what the other institutions Duke liked to compare itself to were doing. The main topic for discussion today was the Strategic Plan which was a problematic document to say the least. A lot of the statements in it made the point that Duke was among the top ten private universities in the United States and that it aspired to be among the handful- meaning less than ten- institutions that had true world class status. None of the top ten or fifteen private universities in the United States had geosciences as a division. They all either had stand-alone school status or full department status. The overhead graphs showed that the thirteen universities (Cal Tech, MIT, Columbia, Stanford, Chicago, Harvard, Cornell, Brown, Princeton, Hopkins, Yale, Northwestern, Rice) had invested historically in the earth sciences. As a consequence, they had far better quality and far better rankings than Duke. Duke had failed to invest. A lot of lip service had been given by past deans, current deans, the past provost and the current provost about how Duke would invest in it. There were eleven faculty now. Four were lost over the last six years. Two had been replaced. How could this be called growth? Not only had Earth Sciences not been supported but they had been diminished by giving them division status within an environmental school. Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Cornell, and Brown were approaching it differently; who was right? He thought they were right. There were four or three other professional schools that had environmental stand-alone schools and they all had geoscience departments except Duke. They all had lots more faculty than Duke. By putting the Geology Department or geosciences in the School of the Environment, Duke was doing something quite different from what anyone else was doing. It was really a way of perpetuating mediocrity in the earth sciences at Duke University. He was unable to understand why anyone would want to perpetuate mediocrity at any university.

In the subsequent discussion Prof. **Staddon** (Natural Sciences) asked for a short response from Dean Christensen who replied that he was

not prepared to do so. Prof. Dan **Gauthier** (Natural Sciences) remarked that compared to the universities mentioned, the number of faculty in the other science departments at Duke was small as well. Prof. **Rostajczer** replied that Duke placed insufficient value on the physical sciences. He thought that there were people at Duke making decisions they were ignorant about. Prof. **Hochmuth** (Engineering) thought discussing the relationship between ranking and size was like beating a dead horse; more to the point was the question concerning the future of earth sciences at Duke. Dean **Christensen** defended his plan of incremental growth, because the level of growth was tied to available resources. Prof. Barbara **Shaw** (Natural Sciences) thought a more specific response to and more discussion of the issues raised by Stuart **Rojstaczer** were needed especially regarding his remarks concerning the physical sciences faculty at Duke of which she was a member herself. Hence, she wished to move that the motion on the floor be tabled until January. The **Chair** reminded members that Prof. **Rojstaczer** had suggested at the last meeting that Council vote favorably on the motion but that if a motion to table was made then it had to be entertained. Prof. **Shaw** made the motion to table which was seconded and **defeated** by voice vote without further discussion.

Provost Peter **Lange** now came to the podium to endorse the motion on the floor, namely to vote in favor of the ECAC resolution concerning the name change and creation of three divisions for NSOE. He gave an overview of the history of the project and his reasons for endorsing the resolution before Council. Specifically, and by way of responding to Prof. **Rojstaczer's** criticisms, he wished to address three issues: 1) shotgun marriages, 2) progress, and 3) faculty involvement. It was not his intent to revisit a decision that was made four years ago and in which he had no part and which had nothing to do with the substance of the present resolution. Staying with the 'shotgun marriage' metaphor, he characterized the union of Geology with NSOE as a modern variant of such a marriage that was based on mutual respect, independence, and joint strengthening. Regarding progress, the second item on his list, he reminded his audience that Professor Rojstaczer himself had indicated that some progress had been made since the integration of EOS into NSOE. There could be no question but that EOS had been contributing more to the university since integration. A good example was the undergraduate major. There had been a steady increase in graduating majors from a low of six in 1996 to a high of 13 in 2000-01. Undergraduate enrollments in courses taught by the EOS faculty had grown from about 633 in 1995-96 to 935 in 1999-2000 in a steady rise. He had been told that one of the factors contributing to this increase had been the integration into NSOE whereby EOS courses could be combined with courses in other parts of the school. While progress had been made regarding graduate enrollments, other areas still needed improvement. The faculty needed building. But as members heard last week there was a new search underway in the department now and the dean was also negotiating currently with an external candidate for a Nicholas

chair recommended to him by the Distinguished Professors Committee and approved by the Provost. This was also part of the process that was shifting the intellectual center of gravity in the department toward areas that were more at the heart of where many such departments were moving today. Being in the Nicholas School strengthened the ability of EOS to recruit in these areas. There was a second problem. The separation in space of the EOS from the second part of the school which was in the LSRC. It was likely to remain a problem for a substantial period of time. But it was something they knew and recognized and may be able to work toward resolving perhaps at the end of the current planning period when a number of other space issues associated with the plan which would be discussed subsequently had been made. He was not saying that would happen but may happen. They were certainly aware that the lack of integration of the School in physical terms contributed to the lack of the ability of the School to fully integrate intellectually. Third, there were and had been significant morale problems, but as members heard from several faculty in the department last week, these appeared to be substantially on the mend in consequence of the recommended changes being examined and discussed today, and he would stress even more the process that produced those recommendations.

His final point was faculty involvement coupled with active administrative involvement. The external review which had been referenced produced advice to the administration. This advice was considered. The crucial decision that only the Provost could make with respect to this advice was whether EOS should remain in the School or move back to Arts and Sciences or perhaps to another school within the university. During the process of making that decision he consulted not only with the deans and other administrators in the relevant units and with knowledge of the relevant history, but also with faculty including meetings with the EOS faculty and with the division of the Environment faculty. That process led to the decision on his part to keep EOS in NSOE, a firm decision that obviously set the stage for all that followed leading to the recommendations before Council today. Had that decision been different the whole set of processes subsequently would have been different. Nonetheless, the recommendations that were before the membership in light of that decision were the product of a faculty driven process. Subsequent to his decision to keep EOS within the School of the Environment, a task force led by one of the most senior and experienced EOS faculty members, Ron **Perkins**, was appointed from the faculty throughout the School. In the early summer, a task force report was prepared. Subsequent to that the NSOE Faculty Council considered the report and developed the recommendations before Council. He had absolutely no role in the development of those specific recommendations nor did he play any role except one visit to the task force. The faculty of the School voted on each of those recommendations. At the last meeting, Professor **Rojstaczer** himself, who was a persistent opponent of merger and a critic of the decision to keep EOS in NSOE, indicated

his support for the recommendations despite his strong objections to the process that preceded. The Provost strongly urged support for the proposals. He wished to add one more item to the issues. It was to be more off the cuff since he did not have access to the information that Stuart had put before the membership today. He could not vouch for the exact numbers with respect either to the rankings which were as already indicated 10 years old nor with respect to the number of faculty in each of those units. It was certainly true that EOS had been and would remain a relatively smaller physical science unit at this university. It was also true as was pointed out by Dan **Gauthier** (Physics) shortly before that most of Duke's natural science departments were small by comparison to Duke's peers. That is a historical legacy that this administration inherited and that dated back to the 40s. There were reasons historically why that was the case. They were reasons that needed to be worked against and that was what was being proposed. But the notion that somehow EOS was being singled out and therefore the geological sciences were some kind of scapegoat for the impoverished character of the number of positions of Duke's physical science and natural science departments was simply false. This was a historical legacy and he could assure the audience that the rankings of the EOS department when it was a geology department were no better than could be expected. Whether they were better today he could not say. There was no ranking which would enable them to know that.

The **Chair** at that point asked for a vote on the resolution. It was **approved** unanimously by acclamation.

#### UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Prof. **Burian** now turned the meeting back to the Provost for a presentation of the draft of the university's strategic plan, called "The University Plan." Significant changes to the draft and a resolution concerning the Plan would come to the Council at its meeting on February 15.

Provost **Lange** said that the planning process which was brought to Council today was the culmination of a long period of activity, lasting approximately 18 months. The Plan as it now stood represented the best thinking of all those involved in its evolution. It showed two parallel and intersecting processes at the [professional] school level and university level. In the process of developing the Plan, the administration consulted on a regular basis with the following committees: the Planning Steering Committee which was appointed in cooperation with ECAC, Academic Priorities Committee, the President's Advisory Committee on Resources, the Deans' Cabinet, the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee, a relatively low key faculty retreat that was held one evening over dinner from the late afternoon through dinner, ECAC, and this Council. Proposals and white papers were also solicited through a working-groups process with extensive

faculty involvement. Not everybody was always pleased with every decision that was made.

Their aspirations over the next five to ten years came really at three levels: the level of the university as a whole, the level of the schools and the level of departments. Today they considered Duke to be a top ten private university competitive with all but the best for undergraduates and their data certainly supported that for graduates and faculty in some programs in Arts and Sciences and other professions. They were not yet competitive with the upper echelon of schools, the so-called CHYMP schools [Columbia, Harvard, Yale, MIT, Princeton]. Duke's goal as the outcome of their planning process was to move to the top of its echelon at the end of this planning period over the next 5-10 years. Longer term, it was thought that Duke could move into that group of the most elite universities in terms of teaching and research excellence and of service to society. But that was a longer term goal. At the level of individual schools, they saw basically three tiers. There were three schools which were demonstrably already in the top echelon: Fuqua School of Business, the School of Medicine and the Divinity School. It would be necessary to protect their excellence with support and innovation. Three other schools were pretty close to that top group but not quite there: Arts & Sciences, Law and in a special way the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences. In those schools the current base should be used to build initial points of true excellence. Finally the planning provided Duke with the opportunity to make major moves in two schools: the Pratt School of Engineering which was the one that most people had heard about and, of course, the School of Nursing.

At the department level it was clear that departments were critical to the success of the overall university. The plans for departmental development were driven by the schools with oversight from the Provost through the normal management process. What they were seeking to do and what the deans were encouraged to do and what the school plans basically emphasized was on the one hand to identify the best or close to the best and strategically invest in them to strengthen and to maintain them and on the other to identify crucial weaknesses and build through strategic investment in areas of major intellectual dynamism available internal and external resources and synergy. As part of the planning process they had developed eight goals which were the eight overarching goals that structure Part 2 of the Plan: 1) Faculty development as the highest priority; 2) Science and Engineering must be strengthened; 3) Integrating teaching, learning, and research as distinctive for Duke; 4) Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs were critical to Duke's excellence; 5) Promote diversity; 6) Incorporate technology; 7) Provide education of highest quality to the best possible students; 8) Extend Duke's global reach and influence. Their efforts and resources were directed toward achieving these goals and the planning documents laid out in detail the specific actions and the benchmarks that they believed would

allow them to move forward.

In order to attain these goals Duke would have to improve the quality of the faculty in significant ways, both in hiring and retention and that the highest standards in the evaluation and reward of teaching and research were employed. Science and engineering would require major investments. Certain schools had to grow to reach critical mass regarding faculty excellence vis a vis their competitors, namely Pratt, Fuqua, and Law. Strengthening the focus on interdisciplinary programs was essential to make the broadest possible impact, to maximize limited faculty size and deepening of resources. Continued improvement of student quality and providing better facilities were also essential. The latter factor was crucial in enabling faculty to carry out their research and in obtaining grants, especially in the sciences. The Provost identified four areas of "intensification:" humanities and social sciences, arts and performance, attention to diversity, and globalization.

In order to attain these goals, the planners had engaged in significant financial projections and calculations at several levels to support the Plan. The Board of Trustees was presented with a strategic assessment of key revenue streams, central resources for strategic investment were identified and the Board approved a new endowment spending rate policy which was crucial for the Plan. School-based financial planning, academic investment proposals and a strategic investment proposal rounded out the financial side of the equation. The strategic investment plan to be presented to the Board of Trustees represented the combination of these proposals for optimum positive impact on the Plan.

The Provost next stressed that managing resources was an ongoing concern and procedures were in place to make sure that the efficient use of existing and future resources was assured through disinvestments and continuous reallocations. It was also the case that in addition to reallocations they would also be undertaking a systematic review of current Centers and Programs to assure that they were continuing to be worthy of the investments of time, money and attention. And all new Programs would have charters, systematic reviews and sunset clauses. They did not want a subsequent administration to be able to find major disinvestment in the programs which they would undertake in this strategic plan.

The strategic investment plan provided for expenditures of \$157M in programs and \$503M in facilities. This was a projection over the next five years. Each area, Arts and Humanities, Sciences and Engineering, Social Sciences, Professional Schools, university-wide priorities, Libraries, Information Technology, Student Life and Services would receive proportional amounts for needed programs and facilities. They were fortunate that approximately \$260M of the \$660M total had already been identified through a combination of strategic resources currently available to the schools, fund-

raising commitments to which specific dollars had already been committed and prospects which had been identified and borrowing for which the schools had assumed responsibility by incorporating the appropriate debt service into their own school plans. That left \$400M that needed identifying centrally through a combination of identifying central resources, additional campaign support, external borrowing, and possible designation of unrestricted quasi endowment. Breaking figures down further, he said that \$165M in central strategic sources could be identified with confidence. They really needed to provide another \$400M (127M for programs and 273M for facilities). In addition, they wanted to reserve \$20M for future opportunities in this five year period. Subtracting \$165M of identified resources from the needed total of \$420M left a gap of \$225M. To close the gap, the Provost proposed three ways to accomplish this: the capital campaign, tax-exempt bond (debt) capacity, and quasi-endowment as a source and/or backstop. Duke had considerable additional potential through the campaign so their efforts needed to be targeted to the specific priorities. \$150M was a potentially feasible goal albeit with an uncertain time line. Because of its low debt to assets ratio, the University could borrow an additional \$225-250M while still protecting its excellent (AA) rating. Finally, the Plan could be financed in part by withdrawals from the University's quasi endowments. Duke's total quasi-endowment had increased by \$332M last year and of that amount \$124M was in funds in the "unassigned income category" available to the President. He thought that with this combination of mechanisms (of which borrowing was the least attractive, because of the debt service and repayment schedule) the financing of The Plan could be fully supported. There was also flexibility involved, because their revenue estimates may have been low because Duke's debt capacity was somewhat flexible.

To answer his rhetorical question as to whether these ambitious plans were necessary, the Provost turned to some comparative data from certain other schools. Cornell was spending \$1.1B on capital projects with \$573M of expenditures planned over the next five years, Columbia, \$520M on construction and renovation for academic programs over the next five years, Stanford \$1.2B on construction and renovation in the next three to five years, Yale \$400M in investment in new science and engineering facilities as part of a \$2.6B ten-year capital campaign, and finally just to remind everybody that down the road there was this place called UNC Chapel Hill and to the east there was this place called North Carolina State both of which—due to the bond referendum which he assumed most of the people present helped vote for would be spending \$500M on capital projects in the near future and State would be spending between \$200-300M on capital projects. Hence, in the face of such competition, Duke had to be aggressive in pursuing its own plans.

The **Chair** now opened the floor for discussion, urging members to take advantage of the fact that the Provost and Vice Provost Harer were present to answer questions.



Prof. **Heitzenrater** (Divinity) was interested in the Provost's comment about those professional schools that were already in the authorized plan, i.e. highly rated. The Provost would be trying to protect those with resources from the strategic plan; could he give an example. He replied that Divinity for example with its rather ambitious building plan which he believed was essential to the School's ability to expand and develop in a way that the dean and the faculty would like, should be assisted from strategic resources. In response to a question from Prof. **Staddon** (Natural Sciences) if it would be feasible to submit written comments which would be included in the minutes, the Provost said that despite their efforts to incorporate criticisms and suggestions from many sources, there was no reason not to welcome more comments. The **Chair** thought it should be possible to have a kind of appendix of faculty comments attached to the minutes to be distributed in January. They could thus become part of the shared record, or to e-mail the Provost directly or ask the Council office to forward them to the Provost via e-mail.

Prof. **Staddon** referred the Provost to p. 34 of The University Plan where the Dean of the Graduate School encouraged faculty to be more productive in terms of research funding, i.e. to increase the percentage of grants by faculty capable of receiving funding. He thought that this would set a dangerous precedent and create an atmosphere which would be detrimental to getting faculty to come to Duke, because those successful in getting grants would be rewarded in terms of space and other resources (with 25%-33% salary increases from their grants) and those that were in fields where such activities were not possible or grants were not needed for research were under pressure to choose research in well-funded areas. This pressure would make Duke unattractive to creative researchers and would inhibit truly innovative work by the faculty who are here. The **Provost** responded by pointing out that it was clear from the data presented with respect to research grant distribution over Duke's faculty and faculty grant activity in some of the departments in which grant activity was indispensable to being a success for faculty in that field, that there were some departments and some areas and some faculty in which the level of grant activity was not up to the standard that could be expected. The question was, however, what kind of incentives could be offered to change that situation. . . 'could be added without corrupting the enterprise,' Prof. **Staddon** interjected. The **Provost** continued, saying that there was some faculty activity that was not research productive who still had a lot of space. He stressed that a distinction needed to be made between 'research productive' and 'grant productive.' He didn't think that faculty who were not research productive should be rewarded with generous space allocation. It all came down to the point of effective utilization of resources and the promotion of research productivity, not research grant productivity. Most schools which Duke compared itself to had a much better system for allocating space in relationship to grant productivity. He thought Jim **Siedow** was

considering whether or not the Office of Research Support could do things to encourage or assist faculty who had perhaps not done so before to get into the grant rhythm. People fell out of the grant rhythm. He also recognized that people had different phases in their careers. Some people were research active for a period of time and then became less research active. What should the University's expectations for their teaching be if, for instance, they became less research productive. Those were serious questions. Research space should not be linked to grant activity, but to research productivity.

Stuart **Rojstaczer** commented that he thought the document bespoke a concern with financial matters and was a plan that was anti-intellectual. It promoted a kind of academic arms race to keep up with the competition. The plan's assumption was that Duke strictly invest in areas where research dollars were available. Duke's goal in this document was the generation of money and the generation of rankings. Duke had evolved from a teaching institution in the 70s to a research institution in the 80s to now an institution where the only thing that really mattered was revenue generation and rankings. There was no intellectual rationale for any of that. It was completely absent in this document. Somehow Duke had to invest in physical sciences which were its weaknesses: Physics, Chemistry, Computer Science, Earth Science. In this document there was really no mechanism to do that. He also castigated the lip service paid to undergraduate instruction, without any substance. He pointed to a "telling" piece of evidence in the Plan (p. 71) namely that Duke's seniors were spending 1-2 hours per week per course which was hardly anything. Duke did not do a good job relative to other universities in that it did not challenge its undergraduates. The document pointed to Curriculum 2000 as a way of increasing the institution's rigor. He failed to see how a change in culture could be legislated.

Provost **Lange** said that Prof. **Rojstaczer** had unintentionally pointed to an error in the planning document (which had been pointed out to him by someone else) and that he was glad for the opportunity to offer a correction. The data really said that Duke's students spend 1-2 hours per week on academic activities outside of the work that they do for courses, hence the conclusions drawn from the erroneous information were, of course, inaccurate. He had made a correction in the text for the Trustees. He was a little befuddled, that there was no academic rationale or that the rationale for this Plan was just a pursuit of money. It was so at variance with both the process and the ambitions that he would just let that sit.

In response to a question about whose ultimate responsibility it was to raise funds to pay for more space for EOS, i.e. that it would likely devolve on the professional schools very much like the time when Arts and Sciences had to chip in toward the cost of LSRC, he said that this was both right and wrong. There was a crucial

difference between the LSRC financing and the Strategic Plan. The former was paid for by projected gifts, grants and research grant productivity of faculty. In the case of the latter, the debt service and the payoff for principle would be accomplished with the commitment of the income from already existing quasi-endowments. As to the questioner's concern regarding debt repayment by the schools because of the disaster that had occurred with LSRC, the answer to that was that their financial plan was devised with that historical memory in mind. There was, however, another issue. Maintenance and operations of future buildings in The Plan's five year budget projections and beyond was to insure that the M & O on the buildings to be constructed was built into the school plans so that, as time goes on, the schools would be able to absorb into their budgets the M&O. Another question for the Provost was if there were investments by the schools in complementary programs; the Provost's response was in the affirmative. In the Fuqua plan there was a plan for financing positions. Duke was not paying for that faculty growth, because Fuqua had built those faculty positions into the financing it had for those strategic positions. What was done was that the administration was assisting Fuqua with central resources to assist with two programs that would essentially bring in the resources available for those new faculty. The fundamental investments, however, were coming from the School for its strategic plan regarding faculty growth. Examples like that could be given from each school.

Prof. Barbara **Shaw** thought it was critical to avoid building new faculty at the expense of alienating older faculty who were research productive, loyal to Duke and had put in a tremendous amount of time and still worked very hard on their particular area of research. They were still research productive, but not research grant productive. It was important to invest in a current faculty and avoid marginalizing those who had remained faithful, who had remained loyal to the university. She thought it was important to avoid creating two classes of faculty, those who had and those who had not received financial support. Sometimes the wrong decisions were made and there was a danger that too much support would be channeled in the direction of those projects and individuals that were perceived as having a dollar payoff. The Provost said that the conclusion was to avoid 'hot payoffs.' Some of the issues that she had mentioned were management issues, i.e. how deans allocate resources, how chairs seek to maximize the use of resources. Those were not issues that the Plan was addressing. The Plan's facilities strategy would prevent the two class faculty problem. There was an effort to upgrade the infrastructure (high quality lab space) for everyone in a particular school or department. He reiterated, however, that there was also a quid pro quo. If one was not research productive, one could not expect to have the highest quality laboratory space and lots of it.

In answer to a question about a change in spending policy, Provost **Lange** said that the Board had agreed to change the spending rate.

It involved the pooling of assets which could then be delivered in a more focused way. The Board said that if the University didn't invest now they might squander an opportunity, so they raised the spending rate from 5 to 5 1/2% with some modifications regarding the endowment account and those funds directly allocated to the dean of a given school.

Given the lateness of the hour, the **Chair** asked for and received a motion to adjourn.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt Faculty  
Secretary

Note: Two attachments to the Minutes

# Comments on *The University Plan*, to be added to the minutes of the November 30 Academic Council meeting

## ***Research Grants***

p. 34, Section b. "Make Space, Salary and Graduate Student Support Dependent to Some Degree on the Level of Sponsored Research in Areas Where it is Available"

The Provost assures us that this provision is not intended to penalize "research-productive" faculty who do not have external funding. I don't believe it will always be interpreted in this way and I fear that it will change the research culture at Duke. The reasons are as follows.

Research funding can be measured precisely, year by year; research productivity is much harder to measure and cannot meaningfully be assessed on an annual time scale. Numbers tend to trump judgment, and the near term usually wins over the long term. Hence, both factors will lead to an emphasis on funding input at the expense of research output.

The incentives to get external funding are already great. A grant yields a salary increment up to 33% and much research cannot be done at all without external funding. My guess is that most faculty who do not apply for grants are not slackers. They have good reasons for spending their time in other ways. Has anyone consulted these people?

"Where it is available": Who is to say what funding is available in what area? I fear pressure on faculty members to choose research in well-funded areas. This pressure will make Duke unattractive to creative researchers, who value freedom above all, and will tend to inhibit truly innovative work by the faculty who are here. Moreover, Federal agencies no longer feel as they did thirty years ago in the aftermath of "Science, the Endless Frontier." Then, the ethos, even in mission-oriented agencies, was "support any excellent research." The major agencies are now much more sensitive to political pressures and much less willing to support work that has no obvious practical application. A mission of the university is the expansion of knowledge, not just immediately useful knowledge. If we are too interested in external funding, this mission is compromised.

I therefore suggest that this sentence be replaced by something less specific, such as:

*Faculty salary and support facilities should bear some long-term relation to research output.*

## ***Research Support***

p. 36, Section g; "Establish a research council of faculty to advise the V-P for research"

Excellent idea. I suggest the first thing they look at are the forms that must now be filled *rnfor Duke*, before a faculty member can fill out the forms required *by the granting agency*. We managed for years without the Duke forms. How many employees spend their time dealing with these forms? Just what would be lost by eliminating them? Certainly, much would be gained.

## ***Diversity***

p. 52: This section combines in equal measure enthusiasm and obscurity. Can - should - diversity be a *goal*? Or is it merely the outcome of a selection process that is fair and thorough? Do we really want diversity, or *tolerance*? And what is *diversity* in any case?

There are some logical problems with the idea that diversity should itself be the goal. For example, even if membership in a group were entirely a matter of chance, historical factors - the kind of "founder effect" that gives Hassidic Jews a near-monopoly of diamond-cutting in New York, for example - historical factors would ensure some deviations from perfect proportionality. And of course, maximum diversity at Duke could be ensured by picking students and faculty entirely at random from the entire population of...the U.S.? The world? an obviously nonsensical proposition. Is there any principled way to define diversity?

Para 2 begins "The word *diversity*... seems a cliché, emptied of real content." May be. So we should define it? Well, no. The next sentence goes on "...the concept needs and merits reaffirmation..." So we don't know what it is, but, undeterred, we're going to reaffirm it anyway. This kind of logic is maintained throughout the rest of this section.

There *is* a principled definition for diversity in the sense it is being used here: Diversity means that the value to the university of a student or faculty member depends not just on his or her qualities, but on the composition of the rest of the population. Thus, when comparing two candidates for a position in physics (say) we should take into account the fact that the proportion of women physicists is less than their proportion in the population, so that female candidates should get an automatic advantage. Similarly for African-Americans and...well, and really no other groups, except perhaps gays and handicapped people.

Is this then the principle behind our promised reaffirmation of diversity? *No*, because it is not applied consistently. We do not give male cultural anthropologists or developmental psychologists a boost, nor male scholars in women's studies, nor white scholars in African-American studies.

So *diversity* isn't about real diversity at all. It is in fact just another way to privilege certain groups - principally women and African-Americans. It is, in other words, all about *power*, as many progressive thinkers have argued in other contexts. If that's what we want to do, fine. Perhaps there are good reasons for such a policy. But let's be honest about it and defend the policy for what it is, not hide it behind the rhetoric of *diversity*.

p. 53, 2<sup>nd</sup> para: This paragraph would surely qualify as a runner-up in the International Bad Writing Contest: We are to "articulate our valuation of people" and "become more sensitive to issues of diversity" whatever they may be. But the core sentiment seems to be "At bottom this [what?] is a matter of simple human decency." In other words, we really know the right thing, let's just do it.

But do we really all know the right thing? There seems currently to be quite a controversy about gay marriage in the Chapel, for example. Some people have searched their consciences and believe that heterosexuality and homosexuality are morally and normatively exactly the same. Others, equally conscientious, believe they are not exactly the same. One group affirms gay marriage, the other believes it to be wrong. There are many other issues of this sort. How are they to be settled? Can they be settled? Would it not make more sense, and be more appropriate to the mission of a great university, not to assume the moral high ground a priori; not to assume that "we all know" the right thing? Would it not be better to affirm instead that our ruling principles should be *civility, toleration and reasoned debate in the search for truth*? Duke should not be party to a covert attempt by one group to impose its preferences on others under the guise of an apparently neutral concept like "diversity." Real diversity would require both acknowledging the many areas where people differ *and affirming those principles of free inquiry*

*that bind us together.* I see little of the former and none of the latter in this unfortunate section on diversity.

p. 54, Action 6: "Insist on diversity as a criterion for excellence in all we do" This is indeed nonsense on stilts in Bentham's phrase. What can it possibly mean in any concrete instance? Do we pick the best mathematician, or not? Or is *best* defined in terms of the other mathematicians? In which case, see above.

p. 54:1 suggest that all these Actions should be eliminated because the basis for them is so poorly thought out. Back to the drawing board, drafters, bearing in mind the possibility that diversity can not be a meaningful *goal*, only the happy outcome of proper selection practices in the service of our core mission to transmit and advance knowledge.

John Staddon (Natural Science)